



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,350	07/20/2000	William J Reid	AUS990912US1	3424

35525 7590 03/24/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

HO, THOMAS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

jil

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/620,350

Applicant(s)

REID, WILLIAM J

Examiner

Thomas M Ho

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-25 and 27-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 16 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 6.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. *Claims 1-40 are pending.*

Response to Arguments

2. The Examiner has fully considered Applicant's previous arguments, but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 5, 16, 26 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim but would have otherwise been allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 12, 18, 21, 22, 23, 28, 31, 34, 36, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by "Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration",

In reference to claim 1:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” discloses a method of updating security configurations of a plurality of servers, comprising:

- Changing security information in a centralized server, where the security information changed is the virus definition file which the user will download, and the centralized server is the site the antivirus program downloads the virus definition from. Gannon (page 1, figure in the middle, virus definitions dated 9/22/1999)
- Receiving an update command, where the update command is received through liveupdate to update the virus definition file. Gannon (page 3, figure at the top)
- Downloading the changed security information to the plurality of servers in response to receiving the update command, wherein the downloaded changed security information is used to update the security configurations of the plurality of servers, where the changed security information is the new virus definition file and is downloaded to a plurality of servers in response to receiving the update command. Gannon (page 5, Item 5)

In reference to claim 7:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” (page 3) discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the update command is received at scheduled periodic times.

In reference to claim 10:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” discloses the method of claim 1, wherein downloading the changed security information includes filtering a directory listing stored on the centralized server to extract the changed security information, where the filtering of a directory listing to extract the security information is inherent.

Norton Antivirus downloads a virus definition file from a centralized server. The centralized server, owned by Symantec systems periodically updates to create new virus definition files. It is inherent that the virus definition file that the client download be located in a directory structure of some kind. For example:

C:\my documents\new files\virus_updates.dat

To access this file, a directory listing is inherently filtered through to access that file.

In reference to claim 11:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the security configurations are updated by filtering the downloaded changed security information to extract only necessary update information for updating the security configurations and then updating the security configurations based on the extracted necessary update information, where the information necessary to update the security information taken is the virus definition file and the updating process once the file has been downloaded is inherent to Norton Antivirus.

Claims 12, 23, 37 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 18, 28, 34, 36 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

Claims 21, 31 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2,3,4,6,8,9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 38, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” and “Windows NT server 4.0”.

In reference to claim 2:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” fails to explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of servers are windows NT servers and the centralized server is a directory server.

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” however does teach that Norton is compatible with a computer running windows NT. (Bottom of page 1) “Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” also teaches that clients using Norton has the ability to check for virus updates from a centralized server.

Norton Antivirus(Page 1) teaches that windows NT servers may be used as the platform on which to run Norton. (This is meant as a reference to clarify details regarding the use Norton Antivirus and is not used in the 103 combination)

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” also does not teach if the centralized server is a directory server or not.

The Examiner takes official notice that using Windows NT server was well known at the time of invention as it was a widely available commercial product.

Windows NT server 4.0 (page 197) discloses that windows NT server may also act as a directory server.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have each client of Norton Antivirus run on Windows NT server and to have the centralized liveupdate server run Windows NT server 4.0 within which directory server functions are

performed in order to allow for greater compatibility between the clients (running windows NT server) and the centralized server (running windows NT server).

In reference to claim 3:

Windows NT server 4.0 (page 199, figure 7.12) discloses method of claim 1, wherein the centralized server is a directory server and wherein changing the security information includes using an editor to change a directory listing in the centralized server.

In reference to claim 4:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” (page 1, figure 1, “using virus definitions dated 9/22/1999) and “Windows NT server 4.0” discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the security configurations of the plurality of servers are updated by updating security parameter lists associated with at least one of files and resources associated with each of the plurality of servers, where the security configuration is the configuration for virus files, where the plurality of servers are the multiple clients using Norton antivirus running on windows NT server, and the security parameters are virus definitions, and the security parameter list is the list of virus definitions contained inherently contained in the virus definition file.

In reference to claim 6:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” fails to disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the update command is received from a network administrator.

A network administrator is merely a person, another user whose function it is to perform network administration tasks. The occupation of the client running Norton Antivirus can be anyone: a banker, a student, a lawyer, or a painter or anyone that wishes to use Norton Antivirus.

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” (page 3) discloses the person who sends the update command is whoever is using the software at the time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention for a network administrator to send the update command in order for the network administrator to perform his or her job duties of providing security for the network.

In reference to claim 8:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration”(page 3) and “Windows NT server 4.0” discloses method of claim 1, wherein the update command is received from one or more of the plurality of servers, where the update command is received from a user running Norton antivirus on windows NT server.

In reference to claim 9:

“Gannon University Norton Antivirus Configuration” and “Windows NT server 4.0” fails to disclose a method wherein the centralized server is a light weight directory access protocol server.

The examiner takes official notice that the lightweight directory access protocol, or LDAP is well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. LDAP defines a standard manner of organizing directory hierarchies and a standard interface for clients to interface with access directory servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the lightweight directory access protocol in the central server because LDAP has broad industry support, and runs directly over TCP/IP.

Claims 13, 38 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

Claims 15, 25, 39 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 4.

Claims 17, 27 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 6.

Claims 19, 29 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 8.

Claims 20, 30 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 9.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M Ho whose telephone number is (571)272-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838.

The Examiner may also be reached through email through Thomas.Ho6@uspto.gov

Art Unit: 2134


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.

General Information/Receptionist Telephone: 571-272-2100 Fax: 703-872-9306

Customer Service Representative Telephone: 571-272-2100 Fax: 703-872-9306

TMH

March 21st 2005


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100